



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

He might have forgotten it würde man zurückübersetzen mit *er hätte es vergessen können*, nicht *er dürfte* etc. *Dürfen* drückt eher eine Wahrscheinlichkeit, als eine bloße Möglichkeit aus; dazu hat der Conj. Praet. *dürfte* fast immer Praesensbedeutung. Also *das dürfte zu schwer sein: that is probably too hard; er dürfte es vergessen haben: he has probably forgotten it*, etc.—§ 474, d. Nach *fühlen, hören, sehen* ist der active Infinitiv mindestens doppelsinnig; man wird ihn stets eher activ als passiv auffassen.—§ 477, Note. *Den Fluss durchschwamm*, nicht *d. F. schwamm*. c. Sätze wie der letzte (mit *um dass*) dürfen dem Schüler nicht als Muster vorgelegt werden.—§ 483. *Erbittert* heisst *exasperated; embittered=verbittert*.—§ 485. *Ja, hören sie einmal* kann je nach der Betonung auf ganz verschiedene Weise übersetzt werden, aber keinesfalls mit *just listen to what I say*; am nächsten käme wol, dem Sinne nach, ein Ausdruck wie: *But, my dear Sir*, etc. *Ja* als Ausrufungswort zu Anfang eines Satzes entspricht dem englischen *Yes* mit angehängtem *that is (would be) all very well* und drückt meist Ungeduld aus. *Hören Sie (einmal)!* ist eine Anrufung wie das englische *(I) say! Kommt er noch nicht* heisst *is he not coming yet?* *Wohl* bedeutet *probably*, nicht *may-be*, manchmal auch *indeed: Das ist wol wahr, that is indeed true*, oder *that is true enough*.—§ 486, 1b. Wenn der Hauptsatz mit *so* beginnt, heisst das *wenn* im Nebensatz stets *if*; so ist es auch in den letzten zwei Beispielen zu übersetzen.—§ 487, Examples 1a. Nach *versteckte* etc. lies *who was ... and who received and concealed* etc.—

Die Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen verlieren dadurch sehr an Wert, dass die allzu reichlichen Anmerkungen dem Schüler oft gar keine Gelegenheit zur selbständigen Anwendung gelernter Regeln übrig lassen. Wozu sollen denn solche Uebersetzungen dienen, wenn z. B. überall angegeben wird, wann der Conjunctiv gebraucht werden muss und wie das Verbalnomen auf *ing* wiederzugeben ist? Anderswo wird in ganz leichten Dingen nachgeholfen, während idiomatische Eigentümlichkeiten, die sich keiner Regel fügen (wie S. 303 *a little way*, S. 311 *the snows of Lapland*, etc.) unerklärt bleiben. Auch sonst finden sich

einige Versehen.—p 303, Ex. IV. Wozu ist *lying* in Klammern?—p 304, Ex. VII. *To restrain* ist hier: *in Schranken (im Zaume) halten*.—p 306, Ex. X. Anm. 1 ist für den Schüler zu unbestimmt.—p. 310 Ex. VIII. *To redeem*, hier: *sühnen*; *to disdain: verschmähen*; Anm. 9 soll wol heissen *anhängen*, aber auch dieses Wort passt hier nicht, vielmehr sollte die ganze, für den Schüler zu schwierige Stelle (*he bis ignominy*) in einer Anmerkung erklärt sein. Ex. IX. *Tend exceedingly: sind sehr dazu angethan; gehen sehr weit* wäre hier undeutsch.—§ 311. *To delight in: seine Freude (Lust) haben an*.

Zur Liste der starken Verba: *Fechten* und *flechten* sollen auch schwach vorkommen? Von *beklemmen* ist nur das Part. Perf. *bekommen* stark. *Klingen* ist immer stark. Das Part. Perf. von *stecken* wird stets schwach gebildet.

Endlich sind die folgenden Druckfehler zu verzeichnen:—§ 134. (§ 87) statt (§ 86).—§ 206. (§ 456, 2.) st. (§ 455, 2.).—§ 427. *Matthei* st. *Matthäi*.—§ 434, c. *ged* st. *get*.—§ 437, 5. *forbode* st. *forebode*.—§ 462. *advatage* st. *advantage*.—§ 475, d. *under* (1) st. *in* § 474.—§ 485, 10. *Das ist wahr* st. *Das ist wohl wahr*.—§ 303, Ex. III. *gone*³ st. *gone*.—§ 308, Ex. V. *mouth*⁷ st. *mouth*.—§ 317. 231 b (vor *schinden*) st. 231 a.

Nach so vielen Ausstellungen gereicht es dem Referenten zur Freude, auch der unterschiedlichen Vorzüge zu gedenken, welche die amerikanische Bearbeitung vor ihrem englischen Originale auszeichnen und die dazu beitragen werden, dem Buche in einer verbesserten Auflage einen Platz unter den besten vorhandenen Schulgrammatiken zu sichern.

HUGO SCHILLING.

Wittenberg College.

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.

After two such reviews of the Joynes-Meissner German Grammar as have appeared in the Notes—with more promised of like kind—surely even a book as limited in its scope and as modest in its pretensions as this declares itself to be, must have some right of defense. That I fully share Mr. Schilling's wish that the book in a future edition may be made as free

as possible from error, is proved by the fact that he had been specially asked to communicate to the editor his suggestions to that end and, also, that at my request the publishers have since addressed a like printed invitation to all teachers known to be using the book. I accept this as the avowed object of his paper—in spite of some, doubtless unconscious, features hardly consistent with this single purpose; and I thank him for whatever corrections he may have made. Yet I cannot but regret, for his own sake as well as mine and the book's, that he did not subject his work to more careful revision. This—not in depreciation of criticism, but in sheer justice—I now propose to do. I shall follow his "points" one by one—so far at least as may suffice for the present purpose; then I shall add a few words of conclusion.

1. § 96. It is an error to say that I divide nouns of the weak declension into not less than six groups. I appeal to the text and the context (§§ 93, 94)
2. § 134. The statement that the combined endings of the pronominal and of the adjective should be learned "both horizontally and vertically" occurs, in smaller type, in one of those *suggestions to teachers*, referred to in the preface, of which nothing more will now be said. That they should be so learned "auswendig" is a gratuitous addition.
3. § 408. The *mnemonic words*, referring to Grimm's Law, are taken, with slight change from the Historical English Grammar of Dr. R. Morris, by whom they are expressly attributed to his friend, the Rev. W. W. Skeat—a surely sufficient authority. They are here expressly intended only as a help for beginners.
4. § 244, etc. The fact that the *Indefinites* are divided, in a first statement, into *pronouns* and *adjectives*;—that, later, some of the latter are included under the general term *pronominals* (with reference to the declension of a following adjective)—and that, finally (under syntax), the entire group is treated in detail as *indefinites*, is perfectly simple, consistent, and logical. The same might be said of the demonstratives, etc.
5. § 481, 2. What is said of the perfect participles of intransitive verbs is a simple statement of the truth. It would not be true to say that such participles have here *active* meaning. *Das gesunkene Schiff* does not mean a *ship that has sunk something else*.
6. § 28. Is the reverse of "apodiktisch." The reference to the "best authorities" clearly implies that there are other authorities and other usage. That I have correctly stated the *best usage* will, I presume, not be denied.
7. Pp. 17-18. That the *Schrift* letters, here copied from Meissner, are not perfect, may be admitted; but many teachers think a fair handwriting makes a better copy than a perfect copper-plate. The microscopic accuracy of the criticism is, however, only suggestive of frequent regret elsewhere.
8. § 85. It would be impossible to believe, *without referring to the text*, that it is nowhere stated that such words as *Jüngling, Heft, Pferd*, etc., are not unlauded in the plural! They occur only in some groups of words given as exercises in the paradigms—and there, without the least reflection on the "Geistesgaben der Amerikanischen Jugend!"
9. § 86. Here *might* be added *mancher* and *solcher*; but they come in better elsewhere.
10. § 88. Might also stand after § 79, but is in its proper place here. *Ihr* "her," here indeed "forgotten," is duly remembered, § 192.
11. § 101. The book gives both forms for *Schmerz*.
12. § 105 is a side remark, in smaller type, calling attention to the occasional occurrence of unusual, or double forms. In so far, it is entirely correct and in place.
13. § 123. Does not *Augäpfel* also mean the "pupil of the eye?"
14. § 132. It would not have been in place to distinguish *here* the plurals *Tücher* and *Tuche*. Such double forms are discussed later.
15. § 175. The forms *habe er*, etc., instead of *er habe*, etc., are given (for imperatives) because they are the more usual forms—as

is stated in the immediate context—(§ 177), and also, more fully and precisely, § 346.

16. § 202, 3. Yes; the statement is too general. "Often" or "usually" should be inserted. Thanks.
17. It is a mistake to say that § 235 "besagt dasselbe wie § 234." See the text.
18. But by far the gravest of all is Mr. Schilling's criticism upon the verb-forms, § 242, 243, 232, 246, which for convenience may be grouped together.—He here charges error, or defect, in not less than 28 of the Strong Verbs—surely a serious charge and deserving, if true, of even severer remark—but can it be possible that so grave a charge could be made if not true? Let us see.

Of these twenty-eight forms, two, *fichst*, *flichst* (for *fichtst*, *flichtst*) occur in the last edition of Meissner, and are not included in the list of misprints kindly sent me by Dr. M.; nor were they noted by any of my accomplished proof-readers. Still, they may be erroneous.

For one, *birst* (for *birstest*) I do not find the requisite authority, though it may exist.

And now, will it be believed that the other 25 forms are given in the grammar with entire correctness, almost in the very terms demanded by Mr. Schilling? And yet this astonishing statement is true! I need only refer to the Alphabetical List, pp. 312-320—a list not included in Meissner's Grammar, but made by me as expressly supplementary to the classified lists (intended for earliest exercise only) from which alone Mr. S. has quoted. This, too, from a critic who, in his very first sentence declares that the relation of my work to Dr. Meissner's has been "festgestellt"—strange coincidence!—by another critic (Dr. Goebel) who, in an express list of "improvements," does not mention this most important addition!!

Can it be possible that Mr. Schilling had not seen this list, but deliberately set himself to review a book which he had not even read *through*? Is this the *deutsche Gründlichkeit* of which we hear so much? Is this what was due to the MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES? or to me? or to himself?

Need I go further? Need I pursue to the end this list of "Punkte," of which there is just one column more—mostly, like the preceding, either mistaken or trivial—to show the essential (yet I would not say, intentional) injustice of this review? That Mr. Schilling has contributed a few useful corrections, I thankfully acknowledge; but I should be too vain if I imagined the book did not need more careful reading and more helpful criticism than his. These, with the aid of all willing friends, I promise to supply, for the next edition.

Now, having so far followed Mr. Schilling's order, I will venture, in a few concluding remarks, to move backwards. The *Veraltete Formen, Verstösse gegen das Idiom*, etc., to which he refers, I hope Mr. S. will not fail to communicate, either through the NOTES or personally. But it is only fair to add that, at different stages, the sheets of this book *were* read by scholars familiar with the best "Sprachgebrauch" in both German and English. The errors which have escaped them all are, I trust, neither many nor serious. Still, they will be gratefully corrected.

As to the opinion that the detailed exhibition of the paradigms, in an elementary book, necessarily demands "das geistestötende Auswendiglernen" I have no reply to make. So far as the remark is meant to apply to the supposed methods of the editor of this book, it is an entire mistake. At the same time, I do deem it proper that the student, or the teacher, who needs to consult a paradigm, should know where to find it, in its most complete form.

Still moving backwards, I read the first sentence, wherein, with sincere regret, I note the starting-point of this review, in an error so grave that it could hardly have failed to lead the writer astray. That Dr. Goebel, in his paper for December, had "im Allgemeinen festgestellt" the relation of my work to Dr. Meissner's original, is, unfortunately, not true. Mr. Schilling's opinion to that effect is, I fear, only an instance of misplaced confidence! Only my respect for Dr. Meissner and for his work has prevented and still prevents me from pursuing this question in detail; but I leave its answer to every candid reader who will

compare the two books. That Dr. Goebel had "gezeichnet" the character of Prof. Harrison's paper (for November) may be true—but the terms in which he did so are certainly to be regretted by every "Fachgenosse."

Finally—and with most regret—I observe that Mr. Schilling's indebtedness to Dr. Goebel begins even before the first sentence, with the title itself: "*Noch Einmal Meissner-Joynes*." The book in question is named by its American proprietors, who have amply satisfied all other rights, the *Joynes-Meissner German Grammar*. This title was intended to represent the nature of the book, which is, moreover, fully and fairly stated on the title-page and in the preface Mr. Schilling, following Dr. Goebel, calls it *Meissner-Joynes*—with what purpose, jocose or serious, I will not pretend to say. But, I submit, this is not even lawful; still less is it courteous; least of all is it worthy of a dignified review. Let me suppose a case: if Mr. Schilling had, for any reasons, subscribed his review with the signature *Schilling-Goebel* would he have deemed it courteous or legitimate in me to quote it by the name *Goebel-Schilling*? Yet just so—only in a far graver matter—have he and Dr. Goebel treated the title of the *Joynes-Meissner German Grammar*.

EDWARD S. JOYNES.

South Carolina College.

P. S.—The editors of the NOTES have been kind enough to send me the proofs of Mr. Schilling's "*Noch Einmal Meissner-Joynes II*," against which I have hardly anything to object, except—as before—the title, for which I hardly hold Mr. S. responsible. I note with pleasure the absence of that *tone*—apparent but, I am sure, unconscious—which was so much regretted in the first paper. I am thankful for many helpful criticisms, while—as before—some, on closer inspection, would appear to be mistaken and others quite unimportant. I have even "heaped a little fire" on Mr. Schilling's head, by correcting some false references and misprints that he had overlooked in his own paper. As to the errors in *German*, it would be amusing to see how far—almost without exception—they are taken without change from Meissner, an "*Eingeborener*;" but this, of course, did not fall within the scope of Mr. Schilling's review, and would be, moreover, no excuse for actual error. I shall thankfully accept his help in a closer inspection of all such points for the next edition.

The only point of Mr. Schilling's second paper that I care to notice, is his criticism upon the chapter on the Relation of German to English, with reference to the brief statement of (or rather, allusion to) Grimm's Law. If he will read more carefully, he will see that I speak only of correspondence *between* the two languages—not of derivation, nor even change, from one to the other. Historical views are expressly excluded (both here and in the preface). Now, the reason for putting the German first was purely *pedagogical*: that is, the German form is considered as the pupil's *datum*, to be correlated with its corresponding English. In certain cases—as in the latter part of my reply to Mr. Schilling's first paper—it may be lawful to *move backwards*. At the same time, I am quite willing to admit—as suggested to me by another very kind critic [Prof. BRANDT]—that it might have been better for my (elementary) purpose to give simply a list of principal correspondences, without any reference to Grimm's Law. At any rate, there is "not enough of this to hurt;" and the limits of the view presented are very clearly stated in the book.

In conclusion, let me again thank Mr. Schilling for the trouble he has taken, with the promise that not one of his suggestions shall be disregarded in the revision of a book of which—with all its faults—he is good enough to speak so kindly.

E. S. J.

Quatre grands poètes du 19^e siècle, Conférences, par ALCÉE FORTIER, professeur à l'Université de Tulane, N. Orléans, 1887.

Ce petit volume nous a intéressé; encore que publié en Louisiane, où la langue française n'est pas morte, Dieu merci, il pourrait bien être, sous son apparence modeste, un signe des temps. Il faut bien qu'on se dise, en effet, que le couronnement des études littéraires est nécessairement polyglotte, et que, pour achever une vue d'ensemble sur la pensée d'un peuple, la langue qui lui sert à l'exprimer est le seul instrument propre à en faire comprendre la portée et les nuances avec fidélité. C'est assez dire que nous voudrions voir l'usage des conférences françaises se multiplier dans les universités américaines, non seulement pour exposer les sujets littéraires aux étudiants des degrés supérieurs, mais encore pour façonner leur oreille aux modulations de la langue et de la parole françaises.

Rien ne vaut l'anglais pour parler de Shakespeare, l'allemand, pour analyser Goethe, et,